

### REMARKS

The drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a). Claims 1 to 8 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1 to 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention was found to be directed to a non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8 to 10 and 12 to 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Dilling et al. (US 6,644,192). Claim 11 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Claims 1, 9, 14 and 16 have been amended. Reconsideration of the application based on the following is respectfully requested

#### Objections under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a)

The drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a) as not showing a shutter-like roller as set forth in claim 14. Claim 14 has now been amended to recite the roller shutter such as 11a shown in Fig. 3. Withdrawal of the objections under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a) thus is respectfully requested.

#### Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1 to 8 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite method steps. Claim 14 has been amended to recite the roller shutter described in the specification.

Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 is respectfully requested.

#### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1 to 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention was directed to a non-statutory subject matter. Claim 1 has been amended to recite method steps.

Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101 thus is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8 to 10 and 12 to 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Dilling et al. (US 6,644,192).

Claims 1, 9 and 16 were rejected as being fully anticipated by Dilling et al. Dilling et al. discloses a web printing unit 3 (see, e.g. column 3, lines 48, 53, 57, see 3 in Fig. 1).

Covers 22 in Dilling et al. are located between the printing units and can only used for service purposes (see, e.g. column 6, lines 14 to 24).

Claims 1, 9 and 16 have been amended to clarify that the opening in the present invention is part of a delivery device and that sheets pass through the opening. No sheets pass through the "openings" in Dillon. The web printing unit cited does not even process sheets but a web.

Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claim 11 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

In light of the above, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The present application is respectfully submitted as being in condition for allowance and applicants respectfully request such action.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By: 

William C. Gehris

Reg. No. 38,156

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC  
485 Seventh Avenue, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10018  
(212) 736-1940